



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

urgency must be crushed between them. The conflict is, in truth, a myth. Is not the very notion that the purposes of the United States Government can run counter to the purposes of God ridiculous? Is not the serious consideration of such a possibility in itself sacrilege? Granted that it is true that man is divinely enjoined "Thou shalt not kill," that by no means makes it true that a man is urged by his God to disobey the commands of his government. If there be any doubt on this point, let us consult the precedents and the law in the case. The authority consulted may be ignored by some, but not by the religious objector. It runs as follows:

And they asked him, saying: "Teacher, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, and acceptest not the person of any, but of a truth teachest the way of God. Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar?"

But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them: "Show me a denarius. Whose image and superscription hath it?"

And they said: "Cæsar's."

And he said unto them: "Then render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

Now, it may be fairly said that the duty of a citizen, whose oath of allegiance has been given and accepted, to bear arms in defense and support of his nation's policies bears "the image and superscription of Cæsar." His government can claim his body and its service as it can claim the U. S. equivalent of *denarii*. It can order him to take arms, to embark, and to take his place in the trenches in France. These are "Cæsar's" to command and the citizen's to render. As for that citizen's conscience—where in Holy Writ is it said that a man's conscience is a matter between himself and his government? The attempt to mingle thus material and spiritual entities is man's own invention and never has it failed to result in his confusion. The strange chemistry that would so amalgamate entities as distinct and apart as earth and Deity results only in raising poisonous cerebral vapors in which are seen the horrendous but virtually non-existent shapes and forms such as this particular pet dilemma of the conscientious objector.

The religious objector bases his case upon his faith in the reality of the Divine injunction. May one not counsel him, for his peace of mind, more courage in that faith? Dare he trust that God is more powerful than government? Dare he believe that his government cannot bring to pass any situation in which his conscientious scruples will be violated? Dare he resolve that his God does not need his help in seeing to it that, if he earnestly desire to obey the Divine command, he may do so? It takes courage, verily, to render unto God the things that are God's. Will the objector help his case, either before God or man, by weakly compromising in the attempt to render God's tribute to Cæsar?

## JOINING THE ISSUE

Controversy over a fact, affirmed by one side and denied by another is known in law as an "issue." Taking up the two sides respectively is called "joining the issue." A great need of the peace movement in the argument with its opponents is first to "join the issue." With this aim in view this department was started. It is hoped that many of our readers will be stirred to add their wisdom to this process of "joining the issue." Any intelligent contribution to the problem, if not too long, will be welcomed.—THE EDITOR.

CARTHAGE, Mo., August 5, 1917.

SIR: Far from being out of sympathy with the cause you represent, I have been in such a state of confusion and dis-

tress owing to the entrance of our country into this terrible world war, that I have neglected to go on with my usual affairs of life, and this largely accounts for my failure to respond to your first letter.

The ADVOCATE OF PEACE I do fully appreciate and it is the rock to which I cling in these times of trouble. If it could be placed in every home in the land, I believe that its monthly message of sound thinking would go a long way in stiffening the determination of the American people to see that this war is a war to end war and to bring about disarmament.

There seems so little else that we, who believe war a wicked sin and that our world can be properly governed, may undertake to bring about this reasonable end.

Sincerely yours, MARTHA C. TAAFFE,  
Missouri Equal Suffrage Association.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., August 6, 1917.

SIR: I want to take time to commend the sentiment of the August number, especially the article entitled "What We Are Supporting." I think it is a good sound basis for every sensible peace man.

Yours truly, REV. G. V. STRYKER,  
Superintendent American International College.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,  
WASHINGTON, August 11, 1917.

The American Peace Society, 612-14 Colorado Building,  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I take pleasure in enclosing annual membership fee and in doing so wish to thank the Society for the high plane, practical as well as high, on which it has placed the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, and also for its excellent editorship. It requires leadership of a high order to determine in any emergency at a period of the world's history when wars have not yet been eliminated from social activities, to determine in behalf of a genuine peace movement, what it is best and most righteous to do. It seems to me that this is the kind of leadership which so far at least as the ADVOCATE OF PEACE is concerned has been given us by the American Peace Society. If I were in a position to make liberal contributions without curtailing contributions in other directions to which I am obligated, I should be glad to make my subscription this year more than usual.

Again thanking you, I am,

Very truly yours, LOUIS F. POST.

The portion following of a letter, which recently appeared in the New York *Tribune*, throws its own light upon the assertion that some forms of pacifism are at the present moment ill-advised:

The mouth of sedition should be shut by a bullet.

I am not boiling with rage, Mr. Editor. I am not even excited. The point is this—my son, my only child, in prompt response to his country's duly sounded call, is today headed for the French trenches, there to be the target for German bullets. Every voice raised here at home to discourage others from going with him, they to back him and he to back them, and so to make their mighty work a success at the least sacrifice to any, increases the chance, already considerable, that he will never come back to his mother and me. I think that that voice ought to be stilled before his has been.